

The Examiner rejected claims 1-11 and 13-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Roath et al. Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's rejection.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegall Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of Calif.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Because Roath et al. does not recite each and every element set forth in claims 1-11 and 13-27, it cannot anticipate the applicant's connector disclosed in the present application.

Independent claims 1 and 22 recite an electrical connector having, *inter alia*, a dielectric housing having a plurality of substantially open receptacles arranged in an array, a plurality of electrically conductive contacts positioned within at least some of said receptacles, a plurality of retention members within the receptacle, at least one of said retention members engaging at least one of said contacts so as to impart an ungapped condition to the connector at the location of the retention member within the housing.

In characterizing Roath et al. as anticipating the invention claimed in claims 1-11 and 13-27, the Examiner characterizes the headers 73 and 74 as retention members. However, even if one were to agree with this characterization, which the applicant does not, these headers do not provide an ungapped condition to the connector at the location of the retention member within the housing. Rather, as clearly shown in the annotated Figures 6B and 7 of Roath et al. (attached), there does in fact exist gaps between the headers 73 and 74 and the housings in which they are received in at least the locations identified on the attached page from Roath et al. Thus, Roath et al. does not disclose, teach or suggest, *inter alia*, an electrical connector having "retention members engaging at least one of said contacts so as to impart an ungapped condition to the connector at the location of the retention member within the housing." Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of independent claims 1 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Roath et al. for at least the above reason. As claims 2-11, 13-21 and 23-27 are ultimately dependent on either independent claim 1 or 22, claims 2-1, 13-21 and 23-27 are likewise not anticipated by Roath et al. for at least the above reason. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 2-11, 13-21 and 23-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Roath et al.

The Examiner rejected the claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roath et al. in view of Laub. Claim 12 is ultimately dependent on independent claim 1, which the applicant has argued above is not anticipated by Roath et al. for at least the reason stated above. Laub does not overcome the shortcomings of Roath et al. argued above. Thus, the combination of Roath et al. and Laub cited by the Examiner does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C.

§ 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roath et al. in view of Laub for at least the above reason.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the objections and rejections in view of the above comments, and allowance of all claims is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conversation would facilitate prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney.

Respectfully submitted,  
MOLEX INCORPORATED

Date: December 9, 2002

By:   
Robert J. Zeitler  
Registration No. 37,973  
Attorney of Record

Mailing Address:  
Robert J. Zeitler  
MOLEX INCORPORATED  
2222 Wellington Court  
Lisle, Illinois 60532  
Tel.: (630) 527-4884  
Fax.: (630) 416-4962